

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Managing compliance in violin instruction: The case of the Finnish clitic particles -pA and -pAs in imperatives and hortatives

Stevanovic, Tuire Melisa

John Benjamins

2017

Stevanovic , T M 2017 , Managing compliance in violin instruction: The case of the Finnish clitic particles -pA and -pAs in imperatives and hortatives . in M-L Sorjonen , L Raevaara & E Couper-Kuhlen (eds) , Imperative Turns at Talk : The design of directives in action . Studies in Language and Social Interaction , vol. 30 , John Benjamins , Amsterdam , pp. 357-380 . <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.30>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/310193>

<https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.30>

unspecified

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Managing compliance in violin instruction: The case of the Finnish clitic particles *-pA* and *-pAs* in imperatives and hortatives

Melisa Stevanovic
University of Helsinki

Abstract

The chapter considers the verbal design of Finnish second-person singular imperative and first-person plural hortative turns, asking whether and how those turns where there is a clitic particle *-pA* or *-pAs* attached to the finite verb differ from the non-cliticized turns, and whether *-pA* and *-pAs* are used in similar or dissimilar ways. The imperative and hortative turns used in the analysis are drawn from a data set of four violin lessons with a 5-year-old child and her teacher as the participants. All the imperative and hortative turns analyzed were spoken by the teacher to the child.

The analysis shows that the non-cliticized imperative or hortative turns and the ones with *-pA* or *-pAs* are used differently. The non-cliticized turns are common in contexts where the speaker and the recipient are actively engaged in an ongoing collaboration. The imperative and hortative turns with *-pA* occur characteristically after the recipient's immediately preceding failures, which need to be remedied for the participants to be able to continue what they are up to. The imperatives and hortatives with *-pAs*

are frequently used at activity transitions, where the speaker demonstrates her right to determine the broader agenda of the participants' joint activity.

The chapter suggests that the linguistic design of Finnish second-person singular imperative and first-person plural hortative turns is informed by the speaker's understanding of the extent to which, and the particular sense in which, the participants' current actions are to be seen as joint ones. While the selection between imperatives and hortatives is warranted by the identity of the agent(s) of the nominated action (whether it is the recipient alone, or both the speaker and the recipient together), it is in and through the choices between the cliticized and non-cliticized formats that speakers invoke and manage the more specific basis upon which the recipient's compliance can be expected.

Key words

directives, imperatives, hortatives, Finnish particle clitics, deontic status, instructional interaction, violin lessons, joint activity, commitment, institutional agenda

1. Introduction

Within the field of conversation analysis, there has been a growing interest in how imperatively formatted directives configure in the management of

practical action. The warrant for the selection of the imperative format has been discussed, for example, with reference to the multimodal and temporal context of cooperative activities (e.g., Keisanen and Rauniomaa 2012; Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, 2014; Mondada 2013, 2014) and to the fit of the requested action with the trajectory of what the recipient is currently doing (Wootton 1997, 2005; Rossi 2012; Zinken and Ogiermann 2013). Speakers' choices between different ways of requesting recipient action have also been shown to be influenced by contextual considerations such as immediacy, benefactivity, awareness of contingencies surrounding the granting of a request, and – more generally – who the participants are to each other (Curl and Drew 2008; Craven and Potter 2010; Antaki and Kent 2012; Stevanovic 2013b; Clayman & Heritage 2015). All these aspects of context influence the speakers' orientations to the expectations of compliance by the recipient. In this paper, the term *deontic status* (Stevanovic 2011; 2013a; 2013b; Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2012, 2014) will be used to describe a position of social standing in a specific domain of action where there are specific grounds for a speaker to expect the recipient's compliance.

Empirically, this chapter focuses on the linguistic design of Finnish *second-person singular imperatives* and *first-person-plural hortatives*.¹ Syntactically, these two directive forms are similar in that their finite verb normally occurs in the sentence-initial position with no overt subject pronoun. Notably, however, in Finnish colloquial speech (and thus also in my data) a first-person plural hortative is formulated by using a passive declarative form (see Shore 1986, 1988; Lauranto 2013, 2014, 2015: 30-31, 43; see also Aikhenvald 2010: 52), which – as I will show below – has implications for the interactional functions of the format. In principle, however, the main difference between the second-person singular imperatives and the first-person plural hortatives lies in whether the targeted agent of the nominated action (see Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki 2015) is the recipient only (imperatives) or whether both the speaker and the recipient are to get involved in the action (hortatives).

The imperative and hortative turns used in the analysis of this study are drawn from a data set of four violin lessons with a 5-year-old child and her teacher as the participants. All the imperative and hortative turns analyzed were spoken by the teacher to the child. Within the activity

¹ The term “hortative” has been commonly used to refer to directives with other than the second person as the addressee(s) (see e.g., Jary and Kissine 2014: 26–31). In this paper, the term is used specifically to refer to the first-person plural directives. Here the question is about the same forms that Lauranto (2013, 2014, 2015) has called “syntactic imperatives” and Aikhenvald (2010: 4-5) “non-canonical imperatives.”

framework of instructional interaction, it is the teacher's institutional right and obligation to tell his/her student what to do. However, the securing of the students' compliance may sometimes call for the teacher to highlight those particular circumstances that allow him/her to expect the recipient's compliance – that is, to invoke his/her deontic status within the domain of the particular activity framework (violin lessons, in this case). This chapter suggests that, in the context of instructional interaction, the use of the Finnish clitic particles *-pA* or *-pAs* in connection with imperatives and hortatives serves such goals.

1.1 The Finnish clitic particles -pA and -pAs

The Finnish clitic particle *-pA* (realized as *-pa* or *-pä*, subject to vowel harmony) has several different interactional functions, which depend on its host word and the rest of the utterance (Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 833–835). For example, when attached to a finite verb in the indicative form, occurring at the beginning of a declarative clause, *-pA* gives the utterance a specific exclamatory force that would not otherwise be there (*Onpa täällä kuuma!* 'Oh my, how hot it is!'). When occurring at the end of a conditional verb form, the particle transforms the utterance from a hypothetical statement into an expression of desire (*Saisinpa ruokaa!* 'I wish I could get food!'). In connection with imperatives, however, the interactional function of *-pA*

appears to be somewhat less tangible. According to the previous literature, *-pA* has been suggested to work to mitigate the directive aspect of its host utterances; speakers high in social hierarchy have been seen to use these particles to mark their directives as unproblematic (Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 835, 1672).

Another particle to be discussed in this chapter is the compound particle *-pAs*, which consists of two successive clitic particles: *-pA* and *-s* (Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 836). In connection with question words, *-s* gives the utterance an additional meaning that can be at least partially captured by the expression “actually” (*Mites se menikään?* ‘How did it actually go?’ Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 837). Furthermore, Raevaara (2004) has shown that, in *wh*-interrogatives, the clitic *-s* marks the information seeking activity as a joint activity, while indicating that the questioner is not really expecting any specific answer from the co-participant. When attached to imperatives, *-s* has been suggested to lend the utterance a flavor of plea and immediacy (*Odota nyt vähän kun katson* ‘Will you please wait and let me look’; Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 838). It is in the context of imperatives, however, that *-s* frequently co-occurs with *-pA*. Still, the question about the possible differences between the imperatives with *-pA*, on the one hand, and *-pAs*, on the other, has not been addressed in the previous literature. The overall assumption has been that *-pA* and *-pAs* function in relatively similar ways (Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 833).

In this chapter, I aim to complement the existing picture about the usages and functions of the Finnish clitic particles *-pA* and *-pAs*. I consider the verbal design of Finnish imperative and hortative turns, asking whether and how the formats with the clitic particles *-pA* or *-pAs* differ from non-cliticized formats (formats where the finite verb of the utterance involves no clitic particle). In addition, I try to find out whether there are differences in the ways in which *-pA* and *-pAs* are used in the context of imperatives and hortatives.

1.2 Music instruction as the research context

The data for my study come from instructional interaction, which has been extensively studied within the domain of conversation analysis (see e.g., McHoul 1978; Lerner 1995; De Stefani and Gazin 2014). More specifically, I will study instructional interaction in the context of music instruction, which has also been a target of several conversation analytic studies; there are studies on instructional interaction in settings such as orchestra and choir rehearsals (Weeks 1996; Merlino 2014; Parton 2014), vocal master classes (Szczepek Reed, Reed and Haddon 2013; Reed and Szczepek Reed 2014), and private instrumental lessons (Nishizaka 2006). These studies – like a great number of conversation analytic studies from other instructional settings (see e.g. Macbeth 1991, 2004) – have focused on how teachers

display their epistemic authority through evaluations and corrections of the student's performance (see Barbieri 2014), while implementing their instructional actions either through talk (Weeks 1996) or gestures (Veronesi 2014), or with reference to the physical environment (Nishizaka 2006). Many conversation analytic studies on music instruction have also discussed the epistemic bases for teacher evaluations and corrections. Thus, Parton (2014), for example, has described how orchestra conductors appeal to their auditory perceptions and corporeal experiences as part of their construction of authority in orchestral rehearsal. In a similar vein, Reed and Sczcepek Reed (2014) have examined the ways in which masters in vocal master classes display their access to specific features of the musical performance.

In this study, I will also discuss the participants' management of authority during music instruction. However, while the above-mentioned studies have focused on the evaluative and corrective third-position actions by the teacher, my focus in this study will be on the first-position formulations of instructions. Thus, while in the above-mentioned studies, the teacher's authority has been considered primarily from the point of view of its *epistemic* dimension – which has to do with the participants' relative access to knowledge, events and experiences, as well as their right to describe or evaluate states of affairs (Heritage and Raymond 2005) – the present focus on the formulation of instructions shifts the attention toward the *deontic* dimension of authority – which has to do with the participants'

rights to determine what should be done (Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2012). Nonetheless, as I will show below, these two domains of authority are tightly intertwined. Deontic authority can be both warranted by and disguised in epistemic authority.

1.3 Data and method

The data for this study consist of four video-recorded violin lessons with a 5-year-old child, Nea, and her teacher as the participants. The lessons were recorded in spring 2012 at a point when the young violin student had already been playing her instrument for half a year. Each of the four lessons lasted approximately 30 minutes, which resulted in about two hours of data. Even if the interactions in the recordings are almost entirely dyadic, taking place between the teacher and the child, there was a third person in the room: the child's grandmother, who also operated the video camera and occasionally provided piano accompaniment for Nea's violin pieces. The data were transcribed according to the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (Schegloff 2007: 265-269), complemented with several new signs to capture the essential features of different types of music-making taking place during the lessons (see Appendix A).

The data contain a wide range of different types of directives issued by the teacher to the child. In this chapter, I focus on a subset of these

directives – that is, on collections of 217 second-person singular imperatives and 195 first-person plural hortatives. On the basis of their formats, the instances within the two collections have been further divided into (1) those with the non-cliticized format, without any clitic particle, (2) those with the clitic particle *-pA*, and (3) those with the compound clitic particle *-pAs*. Even if these three format categories do not entirely exhaust the different types of imperatives and hortatives in the two collections (see Table 1 for the cases with the clitic particle *-s*), in this chapter I will focus only on them.

Second-person singular imperatives	Non-cliticized	55	(25 %)
	With <i>-pA</i>	101	(47 %)
	With <i>-pAs</i>	53	(24 %)
	With <i>-s</i>	8	(4 %)
	Total	217	(100 %)
First-person plural hortatives	Non-cliticized	108	(55 %)
	With <i>-pA</i>	9	(5 %)
	With <i>-pAs</i>	60	(31 %)
	With <i>-s</i>	18	(9 %)
	Total	195	(100 %)

Table 1. Second-person singular imperatives and first-person plural hortatives issued by the teacher to the child during the four violin lessons.

In the collections of second-person singular imperatives and first-person plural hortatives, instances of non-cliticized imperatives, ones with *-pA*, and

ones with *-pAs* have different frequencies and distributions (see Table 1). In the collection of second-person singular imperatives, the format [imperative finite verb + *-pA*] is the most frequent one (101 cases), while both the non-cliticized format and the format [imperative finite verb + *-pAs*] are somewhat less common (59 and 54 cases). By contrast, in the collection of first-person plural hortatives, most common is the non-cliticized format (108 cases), while *-pAs* occurs approximately half as often (60 cases). In this collection, the format with the clitic particle *-pA* is very rare (8 cases).

The above mentioned quantitative differences between the two collections point to the possibility that *-pA* and *-pAs* may have different functions, which would make each of them more suitable for one type of imperative or hortative utterance context than for the other. In the following, I will set out to investigate this issue. The data extracts to be analyzed exemplify patterns that I have identified through the examination of the entire data.

2. Analysis

In this section, I will analyze data extracts representing the patterns identified in the examination of the two previously described collections. I will start with the non-cliticized cases, proceeding to the ones with *-pA* and

concluding with the ones with *-pas*. Within each of these three categories, both second-person singular imperatives and first-person plural hortatives will be analyzed.

2.1 Non-cliticized imperatives and hortatives

In my data, the non-cliticized imperatives and hortatives – that is, turns where the finite verb involves no clitic particle – regularly occur in interactional environments where the participants are already actively engaged in a joint action or activity (cf. Rossi 2012). While this turn format is the most frequent one in the collection of first-person plural hortatives (108/211 cases), this is not the case in the collection of second-person singular imperatives (59/222 cases), where formats other than the non-cliticized ones have a greater prevalence. This distributional difference already points to the possibility that the specific warrants for the usage of the non-cliticized first-person plural hortatives are different from those for the usage of the non-cliticized second-person singular imperatives – something to be considered next.

2.1.1 Second-person singular imperatives





In the instances of second-person singular imperatives, the targeted agent of the nominated action is the recipient only. As has been pointed out in the

studies already mentioned above (e.g., Keisanen and Rauniomaa 2012; Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, 2014; Mondada 2013; 2014; Wootton 1997; 2005; Sorjonen 2001; Rossi 2012; Zinken and Ogiermann 2013; Curl and Drew 2008; Craven and Potter 2010; Antaki and Kent 2012; Clayman and Heritage 2015), such utterances are frequently used in interactional environments where the surrounding local circumstances warrant their usage. For example, the amount of effort that is being called for may be very little and the compliance may thus be regarded as self-evident (*Look at this*), or the nominated action may offer a solution to a problem that the recipient has made publicly available through his previous actions (*I'm so hungry – Take a cookie*). In many instances, the nominated action is also part of a larger action or activity that the recipient has already committed herself to. As I will show below, also in my data, there are specific local circumstances warranting the use of the second-person singular imperative format.

In my data, second-person singular imperatives usually occur in the middle of the participants' ongoing actions or activities, serving their further development and successful completion. In Extract 1, such activity consists of Nea (N) playing the violin, her grandmother (G) accompanying her on the piano. Previously, Nea has played the same piece with the teacher assisting her all the time by singing the melody of the piece while using the note names as "lyrics," and pointing to Nea's sheet music to the notes to be

(1) [VT1 11:31]

[01 T: >no ni< [yks kaks lah]t#ee# nyt,
PRT PRT one two go-SG3 PRT
okay [one two it] starts now
[]
02 T: [TP TP TP]

03 T: seu[r^{aa} nuo°ttia°]
follow-IMP-SG2 note-PAR
fo[llo^w the notes]
[]
04 N: [ PZ] PZ PZ (.) PZ PZ PZ PZ 
[]
05 G: [ ((Piano)) 

Before the teacher's imperative in line 3, there is nothing in Nea's visible conduct indicating that she might have any other intention than to follow the notes. However, considering the student's young age and the great cognitive challenge associated with the task at hand – playing a new violin piece with piano accompaniment for the first time – the teacher seems to anticipate problems in the student's inclination to read the musical notes and orients to a need to encourage that behavior. Thus, in this context, the teacher's

imperative comes across as something like an anticipatory advice – that is, an attempt to pre-empt possible problems in what her student has set herself to do and most likely wishes to succeed in.

2.1.2 First-person plural hortatives

In my data, first-person plural hortatives also usually occur in the middle of the participants' ongoing actions or activities. Importantly, however, in the first-person plural hortatives, *both* the speaker and the recipient are to get involved in the action, unlike in the instances of second-person singular imperatives, where the targeted agent of the nominated action is the recipient only. This is also reflected in the timing of the (verbal) hortative turn in relation to the (embodied) action nominated by it. As exemplified by Extract 1, the second-person singular imperatives frequently involve an element of immediacy: they are delivered just at the moment at which the recipient's compliance is being called for (see also Mondada, this volume). However, in the instances of the first-person plural hortatives, where both speaker and recipient are the targeted agents of the nominated action, the turn usually co-occurs with the speaker already performing that action, while the recipient follows the speaker by doing the same action with a short lag (cf. also Rauniomaa, this volume).

Extract 2 is drawn from the beginning of a violin lesson. The extract starts by the teacher asking Nea whether she remembers how the violin

(2) [VT1 00:32]

	[]
06 N:	[tällei?]
	like.this	
	[like this]	

↑ _____ ↑
 ((puts her legs together))

07 (0.8) ((N moves her legs apart.))

08 T: nii,
 PRT
 yea

While delivering her hortative turn, the teacher herself does the action nominated in it: during the word *pikkunen* ‘small,’ she takes a little step to the left with her left foot, thus moving her legs slightly apart (line 5). In this way, the teacher’s action acquires a descriptive character; she as it were explains to her student what they both currently need to do. Nea’s subsequent utterance (*tällei* ‘like this,’ line 6) is in line with the descriptive character of the teacher’s previous turn. On the one hand, the turn comes across as a request for confirmation (note the teacher’s *nii* ‘yea’ in line 8), but on the other hand, it can also be heard as a display of understanding: it frames her subsequent embodied conduct as a demonstration of knowledge about the correct realization of the nominated action. Notably, she even first puts her legs together (line 6) to be thereafter able to carry out the requested action in a more pronounced manner (line 7).

2.1.3 Summary: Non-cliticized imperatives and hortatives

In sum, the non-cliticized imperatives and hortatives – that is, ones without the clitic particles *-pA* or *-pAs* – regularly occur in interactional environments where the participants are already actively engaged in a joint

action or activity. They have established a state of “joint attention” (Tomasello and Farrar 1986; Kendon 1990; Dunham, Dunham, and Curwin 1993; Tomasello 1995, 1999; Corkum and Moore 1998; Kidwell and Zimmermann 2007; Mondada 2009), and, in this context, the imperatives and hortatives are in the service of what the recipient (either alone or together with the speaker) has locally committed herself to (see also Wootton 1997; Rossi 2012, this volume; Zinken and Ogiermann 2013; Zinken and Deppermann this volume). These circumstances warrant the usage of the non-cliticized imperative and hortative formats.

In the context of second-person singular imperatives, the non-cliticized turns are typically used in an anticipatory way, to pre-empt a possible problem in what the recipient is just about to do. These turns are characterized by the speaker delivering them exactly at that moment when the recipient’s compliance becomes critical. In the context of first-person plural hortatives, however, the non-cliticized turns frequently exhibit a different temporality: while both the speaker and the recipient are involved in the action in question, the speaker’s verbal explication of what is to be done usually co-occurs with her already performing that action. In this way, instead of *prescribing* behavior, the speaker appears to be *describing* it. In other words, what otherwise would be a display of *deontic* authority becomes a matter of *epistemic* authority (Stevanovic and Svennevig 2015). The possibility of such a shift (with its associated face-saving tendencies;

see Stevanovic 2013a) may well account for the frequency of the non-cliticized formats among the first-person plural hortatives.

As pointed out above, in the Finnish language system, second-person singular imperatives are part of the morphological imperative paradigm, while first-person plural hortatives make use of the passive form, where the first-person personal pronoun *me* ‘we’ is absent. In this sense, first-person plural hortatives are similar to morphological imperatives. It is not always easy, however, to make a clear-cut division between the unmistakably hortative passive forms and the other passives of a more descriptive character. (This division is particularly difficult in those cases where the utterance contains a turn-initial verbal element such as *nyt* ‘now’ or *sitten* ‘then’.) This potential ambiguity provided by the particularities of the system of Finnish language may play an important role in the specific temporal relationship between the first-person plural hortatives and the realization of the actions that they nominate. Importantly, it shows that deontic and epistemic issues are interrelated and may not always be distinguishable – neither from the point of view of the researcher, nor from that of the participants themselves. Indeed, it may be precisely this ambiguity that serves as a resource for the participants to manage joint action effectively without appearing too bossy.

2.2 Imperatives and hortatives with -pa

In the previous section, the warrant for the issuing of non-cliticized imperatives and hortatives has been shown to be rooted in the recipient already displaying commitment to the ongoing joint action or activity (cf. Zinken and Deppermann this volume). In the instances of turns with the format [imperative/hortative + *-pA*], such a warrant is different. As I will argue in the following, such a warrant is grounded in there having been a problem in what has happened in the immediately preceding interaction.

2.2.1 Second-person singular imperatives

In the collection of second-person singular imperatives the format [imperative + *-pA*] is the most frequent one (101/222 cases). As I will demonstrate next, the warrant for using a *-pA* imperative turn lies in there having been a problem in the recipient's past behavior.

In Extract 3, Nea has previously held her violin in what the participants refer to as the “rest position.” Thereafter, the teacher has given her step-by-step instructions as to what movements to make in order to get the violin properly in its place by the neck. The extract starts at the point where the initial steps (having to do with the relaxation of the arms) have been successfully completed, but the last critical steps are still to be taken. At the beginning of the extract, the teacher urges the student to put the violin in its place (line 1). Nea, however, tries to put it on her *right* shoulder

(line 2), which is categorically wrong. This is thus followed by the teacher instructing Nea – both verbally and bodily – to move the violin to her left side (lines 3–6). Thereafter, the teacher tells Nea to turn her head towards the violin (line 7) – so that her chin will help her to keep the violin up without having to rely too much on her left arm. After that, the violin nevertheless starts to go down, making it clear that the whole process of placing the violin has somehow failed.

(3) [VT1 1:44]

- 01 T: ja sitte laitat sen sinne olalle
and PRT put-SG2 DEM-SG3-GEN to.there shoulder-ALL
and then you put it there onto the shoulder
- 02 (1.2) ((N tries to put the violin on her right shoulder.))
- 03 T: laitat sen tänne ↑toise^olle puolelle^o
put-SG2 DEM-SG3-GEN here other-ALL side-ALL
you put it here on the other side
- 04 (0.8) ((T grasps the violin.))
- 05 T: tuo^olle puolelle^o ((puts the violin on
DEM-SG2-ALL side-ALL Nea's left shoulder))
on that side
- 06 (2.5) ((T tries to position the violin correctly.))
- 07 T: ja sitte käännät sen pään °sinne°
and PRT turn-SG2 DEM-SG3-GEN head-GEN there
and you turn that head there
- 08 (3.1) ((The other end of the violin starts to go down.))
- 09 T: joo-o? **kokeileppa** vielä ottaa se siihe
PRT try-IMP-SG2-CLI PRT take-INF DEM-SG3 in.that
okay try again to take it to that
- 10 lep#oasentoon ja# .h sitt#en laitat sen#

rest.position-ILL and PRT put-SG2 DEM-SG3-GEN
rest position and then you put it

In response to Nea having failed to place the violin correctly, the teacher tells her to put her violin again into the “rest position,” from where they originally started and will now start again (lines 9–10). In doing this, she uses the format [imperative + *-pA*]. The *-pA* imperative turn, in other words, occurs in a context where the recipient’s previous behavior has been wanting. This pattern, which in my data collection is typical for instances of this type, suggests that one aspect of the *-pA* imperative turns is that they mark the nominated action as something that needs to be done, given the participants’ joint commitment to the ongoing activity and the recipient’s previous failures, which caused a break in the expected trajectory of that activity. The *-pA* imperative turn thus forwards the expected trajectory again by marking a return to it or a retry of forwarding it, while the clitic *-pA* points to the jointly known reason for the return or retry.

Let us now turn to an instance where the speaker’s choice of the format [imperative + *-pA*] comes across more clearly as a strategy to *invoke* the recipient’s past failures – failures that the recipient herself may not have been aware of. Extract 4 begins with the teacher trying to prompt Nea to start studying a new violin piece, first by singing its melody together with the teacher (lines 1–3). Although Nea starts to sing at some point (line 3), it is obvious that she is not concentrating on the task: she is running back and

forth in the room, not looking at the notes, and consequently singing at the wrong time: she starts too late and sings during a rest (see lines 2 and 3). The teacher thus interrupts the singing task and asks Nea to come and look at the notes (line 4) and to sit (line 6).

(4) [VT1 5:38]

01 T: lauletaanpas tästä. se menee näin. (.)
 sing-IMP-PL1-CLI DEM-SG3-ELA DEM-SG3 go-SG3 like.this
 let's sing from here it goes like this

[02 T:	♪ laa laa [laa ♪ tauko,]]
		la la [la rest]	
		[
	03 N:	[♪ laa laa ♪]	
		[la la]	

04 T: tuuksä kattoo nuo^otista^o
 come-SG2-Q+SG2 look-INF-ILL note-ELA
 will you come to look at the notes

05 (.)

06 sä voit vaikka istua tässä samalla, hh
 SG2 may-SG2 PRT sit-INF here same-ADE
 you could for example sit here at the same time

07 N: hmm,

08 (1.5)

09 T: **tuleppa,** ((snaps her fingers))
 come-IMP-SG2-CLI
 come on

10 (1.0) ((Nea comes to sit.))

11 T: joo-o?
 PRT
 okay

Nea receives the teachers' instructions with a minimal response token *hmm* (line 7) but does not follow them. So, after a relatively long silence (line 8), the teacher issues an imperative *tuleppa* 'come on' (line 9) and snaps her fingers in a way that hints that the student's compliance is expected *now*. And indeed, what happens next is that the student complies (see lines 10–11).

In Extract 4 the imperative turn with the clitic *-pA* occurs in an environment where the recipients' overall behavior has been wanting, given all the previous attempts by the teacher to get Nea to actively engage with the task at hand. From this point of view, the teacher's imperative acquires an element of moral reproach. What is at stake here is the recipient's overall behavior, not her capacity to follow some complex instructions. While the problems of the latter type are something that the recipient may be fully aware of, the larger scale problems of the former type may not be that obvious to the transgressor him/herself – or, at least, they may not publicly treat these problems as problems. The use of the format [imperative + *-pA*] may thus be a way to induce the recipient's awareness of the problematization of his/her prior conduct – in the hope that this will have a desired effect on his/her future conduct.


2.2.2 First-person plural hortatives

While in the collection of second-person singular imperatives, the format [imperative + *-pA*] is very frequent, in the collection of first-person plural hortatives, in contrast, this format is very rare (8/211 cases). Instead of pointing to failures caused by the recipient alone, here, by virtue of both participants being the targeted agents of the nominated action, also the failures triggering the use of the clitic *-pA* may be seen as something for which both the speaker and the recipient are responsible.

In Extract 5, the participants are about to play a specific rhythmic pattern (four 16th notes and two 8th notes) on the different strings of the violin. At the beginning of the extract, the teacher takes Nea's right hand (the bow hand) in hers, declaring – with a non-cliticized first-person plural hortative – that the playing should be started on the E string (line 1). In response to this, Nea, however, starts to move her bow hand in an uncontrolled movement producing a shrill tremolo-like sound (line 2). During the silence that ensues, the teacher tries to mold Nea's fingers to touch the bow correctly (line 3) and then seeks to enhance her overall body posture (lines 4–8).

(5) [VT3 20:07]


01 T: otetaa ee-kielellä? ((takes N's right
 take-IMP-PL1 E.string-ADE hand into hers))
 let's take (it) on the E string

02 N: 

03 (2.2) ((T tries to mold N's right hand fingers.))

((Lines 04-08 removed, during which the teacher corrects Nea's position.))

09 T: no ni? (.) so- **soitetaampa.**
 PRT PRT play-IMP-PL1-CLI
 okay le- let's play

10 T: [tiku-tiku ti-ti]
 rhythm names for four 16th notes and two 8th notes
 [tika-tika ti-ti]
 []
 11 N: []

After having remedied the problem that might have hindered Nea's compliance with her original directive (line 1), the teacher resumes the directive: she utters a first-person plural hortative with the particle *-pA* (*soitetaampa* 'let's play,' line 9). In this case, the targeted agent of the nominated action is *not* the recipient alone for the speaker is also to be involved (indeed, during Nea's subsequent playing, it is the teacher who is actually moving Nea's bow while speaking out loud the rhythm names for the notes to be played; lines 10–11). Thus, in formulating the directive as the first-person-plural hortative, the teacher not only constructs the ongoing activity as a joint one but also indicates that the failure in its expected trajectory, which the clitic *-pA* points at, is something that both the student and the teacher are responsible for (cf. also Rauniomaa in this volume).

2.2.3 Summary: Imperatives and hortatives with *-pA*

In my data, the second-person singular imperatives with the clitic particle – *pA* occur systematically in sequential environments where the recipient has

previously failed to do what s/he has been expected to do. I thus suggest that turns with the format [imperative + *-pA*] not only reflect the prevailing circumstances but can also be used precisely to invoke the speaker's local warrant for the use of the imperative. From this point of view, the clitic *-pA* can be seen as a way to point to a break in the expected trajectory of the participants' joint activity, whereby the teacher invokes her right and obligation as a teacher to instruct, request compliance, and to take care of the agenda of the lesson. In some other contexts there may be no need for such pointing at a local warrant for the use of an imperative or a hortative turn, but instead, the warrant for the use of such turns is also treated as obvious from the recipient's perspective (see Zinken and Deppermann this volume; Rauniomaa this volume; Raevaara this volume). In this setting, however, particularly given the student's young age, it appears that such a common ground cannot be similarly assumed.

In the collections of second-person singular imperatives and first-person plural hortatives, the instances of *-pA* are very unevenly distributed: in the collection of second-person singular imperatives, the format is very frequent, but in the collection of first-person plural hortatives it is very rare. The uneven distribution between these two formats may simply lie in the fact that, in the context of instructional interaction, it is the problems in the *student's* past behaviors, and not in those behaviors where the teacher has

been involved right from the start, that most frequently fail and that the teacher is most inclined to correct.

2.3 Imperatives and hortatives with -pAs

Finally, we will move on to consider the format [imperative/hortative + -*pAs*]. Unlike the -*pA* turns discussed above, -*pAs* turns are very evenly distributed between the collections of second-person singular imperatives (54/222 cases) and first-person plural hortatives (60/211 cases). These turns are most frequently used during transitions from one prior activity to the next – an environment that is generally less sensitive to whether the targeted agent of the nominated action is the recipient only or whether both the speaker and the recipient are to get involved in the action.

The relationship between the two activities between which the transition takes place can vary. Sometimes, as in the two examples that will be discussed below, the new activity may involve a kind of redoing of the previous activity in a modified way. At other times, the new activity may be entirely different from the prior one. However, what is common for all these cases is that, instead of making recipient compliance immediately relevant, these imperative and hortative turns can be heard, more or less, like descriptions of the kind of activity that will require recipient compliance – at a later point in time.

2.3.1 Second-person singular imperatives

In Extract 6, the participants have previously gone through a musical piece with the teacher playing the violin and Nea tapping sticks to the rhythm of the piece. However, Nea has had certain problems in keeping a constant beat – something that the teacher comments on at the beginning of the extract, when the musical piece has been brought to an end (lines 1–2).

(6) [VT2 2:29]

01 T: no sä tulit siihe vähä mukaa mut se (.)
PRT SG2 come-PST-SG2 in.there little along but DEM-SG3
well you came a bit along to it but it

02 menee koko aika iha oikeessa rytmissä taputit,
go-SG3 whole time PRT right-INE rhtythm-INE tap-SG2
goes all the time just in the right rhythm you tapped

03 (.)

04 T: o↑tappas ↑sitte ni (.)
take-IMP-SG2-CLI PRT PRT
take (these) then
((turns to reach for another pair of rhythm sticks))

05 mä annan sulle täältä viulun?
SG1 give-SG1 SG2-ALL from.here violin-GEN
I'll give you the violin from here
((turns toward a sofa to reach for the violin))

06 (0.6)

07 T: 'ja nyt sä voit'
and PRT SG2 can-SG2
and now you can
((holds the violin in her lap))

After the previous playing activity has been brought to a close, the teacher announces a new activity by issuing an imperative with the clitic particle -

pAs (*otappas* ‘take,’ line 4), while at the same time turning away from Nea toward a table to reach for another pair of rhythm sticks, which she will need next (line 4). Then, she declares her intention to give Nea the violin, while turning toward a sofa to reach for it (line 5). Finally, after a short silence (line 6), the teacher starts to explain what the student is supposed to do with the violin while still holding the violin on her lap (Nea will be given the opportunity to “take” the violin only much later, not shown in the transcript). Thus, as in Extract 6, also here the *-pAs* imperative and the realization of the action that it nominates are quite far apart from each other; instead of being about telling the recipient what to do *now*, the *-pAs* imperative (as well as the talk following it) serves as an announcement of the participants’ activity to be realized in the near future and, besides, creates a connection between that activity and the speaker’s current embodied actions.

2.3.2 *First-person plural hortatives*

Similarly to second-person singular imperatives with the clitic *-pAs*, first-person-plural hortatives are also typically used in environments where a previous joint activity has been brought to a close and a new one is about to be launched. While the scope of *-pAs* imperative or hortative turns extends over longer segments of interaction, they invoke the speaker’s deontic status as a person who has the right and obligation to control the participants’

interactional agenda. At the same time, and, indeed, quite intriguingly, these types of turns enable the teacher momentarily to disengage from the student without such disengagement threatening the sensibleness of the social situation as a whole (cf. Stevanovic 2013c). In this respect, *-pAs* imperatives and hortatives seem to function in the same way.

Let us turn to Extract 7, which provides an example of the use of first-person plural hortatives with clitic *-pAs*. Previously, Nea and her teacher have gone through a lengthy series of different kinds of movement exercises for the right hand and arm, the practical point of which has been to develop the skills that one needs to be able to control the bow. The extract starts at the point at which the participants have reached the last item in this series of exercises and this is brought to a close in line 4.

(7) [VT1 20:32]

01 T: sit se ↑tuulilasin pyyhkijä näin.
 PRT DEM-SG3 windscreen-GEN wiper like.this
 then the windscreen wiper like this

02 (3.0) ((T and N make back and forth arm movements.))

03 T: ↑joo hyvä, ((T and N make back and
 PRT good forth arm movements.))
 yea good,

04 (1.1) ((T and N make back and forth arm movements.))

05 T: **otetaanpas** sit se jousi ja
 take-IMP-PL1-CLI PRT DEM-SG3 bow and
 let's then take that bow and
 ((turns away from Nea))

06 T: **kokeillaanpas** sillä jousen kanssa ni (.)


```
try-IMP-PL1-CLI DEM-SG3-ADE bow-GEN with PRT  
let's try with that bow  
((stands up and goes to fetch a bow))
```

```
07 ottaa se sama ote ja (.)  
take-INF DEM-SG3 same grasp and  
to take the same grasp and  
((takes the bow from a violin case))
```

After the last item in the series of movement exercises (the one where the participants are expected to imitate windscreen wipers) has been brought to a close, the teacher announces a new step in the participants' activity: they are to take the bow (line 5) and try to start to play the violin with it (line 6) – using the same grip that they have been practicing during their previous exercises (line 7). These utterances by the teacher contain two first-person plural hortatives with the clitic particle *-pas* (*otetaanpas* 'let's take,' line 5; *kokeillaampas* 'let's try,' line 6), where the realization of the first action sets a precondition for the realization of the second. Note, however, that the relationship between the hortatives and the realization of the very actions that they nominate is more loosely time-locked than in the instances of non-cliticized and *-pa* turns discussed above. While issuing the first hortative *otetaanpas* 'let's take' (line 5), the teacher turns away from Nea, but it is only much later that she indeed takes the bow from a violin case (see line 7). Similarly, while issuing the second hortative *kokeillaampas* 'let's try' (line 6), the teacher is only about to go and fetch the bow, and the actual realization of the nominated action, again, takes place much later (not shown in the transcript). It seems, therefore, that, in telling the student what

they are both to do next, the teacher also provides an account for what she herself is *currently* doing – that is, preparing for the forthcoming activity.

2.3.3 Summary: Imperatives and hortatives with *-pAs*

In sum, in my data, the imperative and hortative turns with the clitic particle *-pAs* occur most frequently during transitions from one prior activity to the next. Instead of making recipient compliance immediately relevant, these imperative and hortative turns can be heard, more or less, as a description of what the participants are about to do soon. Considering the lack of pressure on the recipient to produce an immediate response, *-pAs* imperatives and hortatives thus have similarities to *wh*-interrogatives with the clitic *-s* discussed above (see Raevaara 2004). Contentwise, the activities nominated in *-pAs* imperative or hortative turns are usually ones that will be realized over long segments of interaction. Therefore, the mere issuing of these types of imperatives or hortatives invokes the speaker's deontic status as a person who has the right and obligation to control the participants' interactional agenda. At the same time, *-pAs* turns also serve the local management of interaction: they provide speakers with a way to sustain the encounter even in the face of their momentary lack of bodily orientation toward their recipients.

3. Conclusions

The chapter has demonstrated the ways in which the verbal design of Finnish second-person singular imperative and first-person plural hortative turns is a way for speakers to manage the bases of recipient compliance. From this perspective, the selection between different imperative and hortative formats has been shown to be essentially informed by the speaker's understanding of the extent to which, and the particular sense in which, the participants' current actions are to be seen as joint ones.

The non-cliticized imperatives and hortatives regularly occur in interactional environments where the participants are already actively engaged in a joint action or activity. However, imperatives and hortatives exhibit different temporalities. In the context of second-person singular imperatives, where non-cliticized turns are typically used in an anticipatory way, to pre-empt upcoming problems, the non-cliticized turns are characterized by the speaker delivering them exactly at that moment when the recipient's compliance becomes critical. In the context of first-person plural hortatives, however, the spoken utterances usually co-occur with the speaker already performing the action that is nominated in the turn. Thereby, these directive turns acquire a descriptive character, the resulting ambiguity along the epistemic-deontic dimension being a possible resource for participants to manage and control their joint action in a face-saving

way. More specifically, deontic authority can be both warranted by and disguised in epistemic authority.

This chapter suggests that, in connection with imperatives and hortatives, it is particularly in and through the choices between the clitic particles *-pA* and *-pAs* that speakers may invoke and manage the specific bases upon which the recipient's compliance can be expected. This is something that has not yet been addressed in the previous literature. Without making any distinction between the two clitic particles, it has been suggested, for example, that "a speaker higher in the age, professional or some other type of hierarchy uses the particle to mark his/her request as something that can be unproblematically complied with" (Hakulinen et al. 2004: § 835, 1672). While this study also points to the social hierarchical aspect associated with the usage of *-pA* and *-pAs* imperatives/hortatives, it suggests, however, that that these two options invoke somewhat different bases of recipient compliance.

The format [imperative/hortative + *-pA*] draws attention to the speaker's *locally and interactionally* grounded deontic status in terms of the right to instruct the recipient on the basis of his/her previously demonstrated failures. The format [imperative/hortative + *-pAs*], then again, invokes the *globally and institutionally* grounded right to determine the agenda of the participants' joint activity – something that can also be considered part of the repertoire of things that high-status persons (but not low-status persons)

may do. At the same time, however, these two distinct origins of deontic statuses were deeply intertwined: to instruct a recipient on the basis of his/her previously demonstrated local failures is not an acceptable thing for everyone to do, but it needs to have a more globally accepted basis. Moreover, to announce new activities and thus claim a global right to determine the agenda of the participants' joint activity is also a way to address local issues of accountability of action. It is thus the complex interplay between local and global contextual features, both of which constitute the so-called "common ground" (Clark and Brennan 1991; Clark 1996; Stalnaker 2002; Enfield 2006; Tomasello 2008, 2009) – the set of knowledge, beliefs and suppositions that we believe that we share – that enables us to coordinate our joint actions and activities.

Notably, however, there is a bidirectional linkage between imperative and hortative utterances and the bases for expecting compliance in terms of deontics (Stevanovic 2013b; Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2012, 2014; Stevanovic and Svennevig 2015). In the data of this study, as well as in multiple other data sets by other researchers investigating similar phenomena, speakers were careful to adjust their utterances so as to comply with the prevailing circumstances; they selected just those linguistic formats that would best fit these circumstances. At the same time, this normative orientation has been shown to be amenable to reflexive manipulation: thus, for example, specific imperative formats, such as those with the clitic *-pa*

(see Extract 4), can be selected to invoke those very social circumstances on the basis of which recipient compliance can be expected. In other words, what we observe here is an example of a double constitutive relation between action and its context (see Hanks 2006) – a general feature of all normative aspects of human communication.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Antaki, Charles, and Alexandra Kent. 2012. "Telling People What to Do (and Sometimes, Why): Contingency, Entitlement and Explanation in Staff Requests to Adults with Intellectual Impairments." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 876–889.
- Barbieri, Daniele. 2014. "Discussion Paper: Between Sharing and Discourse." *Social Semiotics* 24(4): 530–539.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Herbert H., and Susan E. Brennan. 1991. "Grounding in Communication." In *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, ed. by Lauren B. Resnick, John M. Levine, and Stephanie D. Teasley, 127–149. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Clayman, Steven, and John Heritage. 2015. "Benefactors and Beneficiaries: Benefactive Status and Stance in the Management of Offers and Requests." In *Requesting in Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 55–86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Corkum, Valerie, and Chris Moore. 1998. "The Origins of Joint Visual Attention in Infants." *Developmental Psychology* 34(1): 28–38.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Marja Etelämäki. 2015. "Nominated Actions and Their Targeted Agents in Finnish Conversational Directives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 78: 7–24.
- Craven, Alexandra, and Jonathan Potter. 2010. "Directives: Entitlement and Contingency in Action." *Discourse Studies* 12(4): 419–442.
- Curl, Traci S., and Paul Drew. 2008. "Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(2): 129–153.

- De Stefani, Elwys, and Anne-Danièle Gazin. 2014. "Instructional Sequences in Driving Lessons: Mobile Participants and the Temporal and Sequential Organization of Actions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 65: 63–79.
- Dunham, Philip J., Frances Dunham, and Ann Curwin. 1993. "Joint-Attentional States and Lexical Acquisition at 18 Months." *Developmental Psychology* 29(5): 827–831.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2006. "Social Consequences of Common Ground." In *Roots of Human Sociality*, ed. by Nicholas J. Enfield, and Stephen C. Levinson, 399–430. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, and Asta Cekaite. 2013. "Calibration in Directive/Response Sequences in Family Interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 46(1): 122–138.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, and Asta Cekaite. 2014. "Orchestrating Directive Trajectories in Communicative Projects in Family Interaction." In *Requesting in Social Interaction: Studies in Language and Social Interaction*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 185–214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivosto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi [The Comprehensive Grammar of Finnish]*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Hanks, William F. 2006. "Context, Communicative." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. by Keith Brown, 115–128. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Heritage, John, and Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. "The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1): 15–38.
- Jary, Mark, and Mikhail Kissine. 2014. *Imperatives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Keisanen, Tiina, and Mirka Rauniomaa. 2012. "The Organization of Participation and Contingency in Pre-beginnings of Requests Sequences." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(4): 323–351.
- Kendon, Adam. 1990. *Conducting interaction: Patterns of Behavior in Focused Interactions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kidwell, Mardi, and Don H. Zimmerman. 2007. "Joint Attention as Action." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(3): 592–611.
- Lauranto, Yrjö. 2013. "Suomen kielen imperatiivi – yksi paradigma, kaksi systeemiä [The imperative in Finnish – one paradigm, two systems]". *Virittäjä* 117(2): 156–200.
- Lauranto, Yrjö. 2014. *Imperatiivi, käsky, direktiivi: Arkikeskustelun vaihtokaupakielioppia [Imperative, order, directive: Exchange*

- grammar of everyday conversation*]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Lauranto, Yrjö. 2015. *Direktiivisyyden rajoja: Suomen kielen vaihtokauppasyntaksia* [*Boundaries of directiveness: Exchange syntax of Finnish*]. <https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/154288>, accessed July 2, 2015.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1995. "Turn Design and the Organization of Participation in Instructional Activities." *Discourse Processes* 19: 111–131.
- Macbeth, Douglas H. 1991. "Teacher Authority as Practical Action." *Linguistics and Education* 3: 281–313.
- Macbeth, Douglas H. 2004. "The Relevance of Repair for Classroom Correction." *Language in Society* 33: 703–736.
- McHoul, Alexander. 1978. "The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom." *Language in Society* 7: 183–213.
- Merlino, Sara. 2014. "Singing in "Another" Language: How Pronunciation Matters in the Organisation of Choral Rehearsals." *Social Semiotics* 24(4): 420–445.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2009. "The Embodied and Negotiated Production of Assessments in Instructed Actions." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42: 329–361.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2009. "Emergent Focused Interactions in Public Places: A Systematic Analysis of the Multimodal Achievement of a Common Interactional Space." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(10): 1977–1997.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2013. "Coordinating Mobile Action in Real Time: The Timely Organization of Directives in Video Games." In *Interaction and Mobility. Language and the Body in Motion*, ed. by Pentti Haddington, Lorenza Mondada, and Maurice Nevile, 300–341. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2014. "Requesting Immediate Action in the Surgical Operating Room: Time, Embodied Resources and Praxeological Embeddedness." In *Requesting in Social Interaction: Studies in Language and Social*, ed. by Paul Drew, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 269–302. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nishizaka, Aug. 2006. "What to Learn: The Embodied Structure of the Environment." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39(2): 119–154.
- Parton, Katharine. 2014. "Epistemic Stance in Orchestral Interaction." *Social Semiotics* 24(4): 402–419.
- Raevaara, Liisa. 2004. "Mitäs me sovittais: S-partikkelin sisältävien hakukysymysten tehtävistä. [On the use of the particle -s in open ended questions]." *Virittäjä* 108(4): 531–558.

- Reed, Darren, and Beatrice Szczepek Reed. 2014. "The Emergence of Learnables in Music Masterclasses." *Social Semiotics* 24(4): 446–467.
- Rossi, Giovanni. 2012. "Bilateral and Unilateral Requests: The Use of Imperatives and Mi X? Interrogatives in Italian." *Discourse Processes* 49(5): 426–58.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. In *Lectures on Conversation, Volume 2*, ed. by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shore, Susanna. 1986. *Onko suomessa passiivia [Is there a passive in Finnish?]*. Suomi 133. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Shore, Susanna. 1988. "On the So-called Finnish Passive." *Word* 39: 151–176.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. "Lääkäriin ohjeet [Doctor's instructions]." In *Keskustelu lääkärin vastaanotolla*, ed. by Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Anssi Peräkylä, and Kari Eskola, 89–111. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 2002. "Common ground." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 701–721.
- Stevanovic, Melisa. 2011. "Participants' Deontic Rights and Action Formation: The Case of Declarative Requests for Action. Interaction and Linguistic Structures." *InLiSt* 52. <http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/52/Inlist52.pdf>
- Stevanovic, Melisa. 2013a. "Constructing a Proposal as a Thought: A Way to Manage Problems in the Initiation of Joint Decision-making in Finnish Workplace Interaction." *Pragmatics* 23(3): 519–544.
- Stevanovic, Melisa. 2013b. *Deontic rights in interaction. A conversation analytic study on authority and cooperation*. Academic dissertation. University of Helsinki, Department of Social Research.
- Stevanovic, Melisa. 2013c. "Managing Participation in Interaction: The Case of Humming." *Text and Talk* 33(1): 113–137.
- Stevanovic, Melisa, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2012. "Deontic Authority in Interaction: The Right to Announce, Propose, and Decide." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(3): 297–321.
- Stevanovic, Melisa, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2014. "Three Orders in the Organization of Human Action: On the Interface between Knowledge, Power, and Emotion in Interaction and Social Relations." *Language in Society* 43(2): 185–207.
- Stevanovic, Melisa, and Jan Svennevig. 2015. "Introduction: Epistemics and Deontics in Conversational Directives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 78: 1–6.
- Szczepek Reed, Beatrice, Darren Reed, and Elizabeth Haddon. 2013. "NOW or NOT NOW: Coordinating Restarts in the Pursuits of Learnables

- in Vocal Masterclasses.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46(1): 22–46.
- Tomasello, Michael. 1995. “Joint Attention as Social Cognition.” In *Joint Attention: Its Origins and Role in Development*, ed. by Chris Moore, and Philip J. Dunham, 103–130. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tomasello, Michael. 1999. *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2008. *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2009. *Why We Cooperate: Based on the 2008 Tanner Lectures on Human Values at Stanford University*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tomasello, Michael, and Michael J. Farrar. 1986. “Joint Attention and Early Language.” *Child Development* 57(6): 1454–63.
- Veronesi, Daniela. 2014. “Correction Sequences and Semiotic Resources in Ensemble Music Workshops: The case of Conduction.” *Social Semiotics* 24(4): 468–494.
- Weeks, Peter. 1996. “A Rehearsal of a Beethoven Passage: An Analysis of Correction Talk.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29(3): 247–290.
- Wootton, Anthony J. 1997. *Interaction and the Development of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wootton, Anthony J. 2005. “Interactional and Sequential Configurations Informing Request Format Selection in Children’s Speech.” In *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction*, ed. by Auli Hakulinen, and Margret Selting, 185–208. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Zinken, Jörg, and Eva Ogiermann. 2013. “Responsibility and Action: Invariants and Diversity in Requests for Objects in British English and Polish Interaction.” *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 46(3): 256–276.

Appendix A

TP	tapping hands
PZ	playing pizzicato
♪	played or sung musical sounds or passages
≡	tremolo-like sound produced by more or less (in)determinate back-and-forth bow movements

▣ down-bow stroke

v up-bow stroke